

- 10 -

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed June 15, 2005.

The specification has been amended as detailed on page 2 of this paper to add a paragraph regarding federally sponsored research or development in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.77(b)(3).

Claims 13, 16, 23, 27, 28, 30, 32, 36, and 37 are amended as detailed above. Claims 14, 15, 24, 26, 29, 33, and 38-42 are cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Following entry of this amendment, claims 13, 16-23, 27, 28, 30-32, 34-37, and 43 are pending.

Following entry of the amendment, the application contains 19 pending claims, 6 of which are independent claims. The application was originally filed with 30 claims, 5 of which were independent. The applicant submitted excess claim fees for the 10 additional claim and the 2 excess independent claims. Accordingly, the applicant believes that an excess claim fee for the sixth independent claim in the application falls due as a result of this amendment. A Fee Transmittal Form filed concurrently herewith authorizes payment of the excess claim fee of \$200.00 under 37 C.F.R. §1.16(h). The applicant believes that no additional excess claim fees are payable as a result of this amendment. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, including excess claim fees, and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2400 in this, concurrent, and future replies.

**Comments on claim amendments**

In the Office Action mailed June 15, 2005, the Examiner indicated that claims 15-22, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 36, 42, and 43 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 13, 32, 34, and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Lampson et al. Claims 14, 23-24, 28, 31, 35, and 41 were rejected as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) having regard to Lampson et al. in view of Knox et al.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

- 11 -

The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the amended claims and the following comments.

Claim 13 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 14 and the allowable subject matter of claim 15. Claims 14 and 15 are cancelled to avoid duplication of claimed subject matter. Claim 16 is amended to depend from claim 13, rather than cancelled claim 15.

Claim 23 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 24 and the allowable subject matter of claim 26. Claims 24 and 26 are cancelled to avoid duplication of claimed subject matter. Claim 27 is amended to depend from claim 23, rather than cancelled claim 26.

Claim 28 is amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 29. Claim 29 is cancelled to avoid duplication of claimed subject matter. Claim 30 is amended to depend from claim 28, rather than cancelled claim 29.

Claim 32 is amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 33. Claim 33 is cancelled to avoid duplication of claimed subject matter. Claims 34 and 35 now depend from amended claim 32, which contains the allowable subject matter of claim 33.

Claim 36, which the Examiner indicated contains allowable subject matter, has been amended into independent form by incorporating all the limitations of claim 32.

Claim 37 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 38-41 and the allowable subject matter of claim 42. Claims 38-42 have been cancelled to avoid duplication of claimed subject matter.

Each independent claim now contains subject matter indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits the dependent claims are in condition for immediate allowance.

- 12 -

Comments on Cited Prior Art

Although the Examiner's Report of June 15, 2005 indicates, at paragraph 2, that the applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-43 filed with the amendment of July 12, 2004, "have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection", the applicant notes that the rejections are essentially identical to the rejections made by the previous Examiner in the Office Action of May 3, 2004. Accordingly, the applicant does not believe that its arguments have been adequately considered. Nevertheless, further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between applicant's claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the foregoing amendments. Applicant's silence to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of acquiescence to or agreement with the stated grounds of rejection.

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a). The applicant respectfully solicits a timely Notice of Allowance and early issuance of this application. If there are any remaining issues that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone the applicant's attorney, Fraser Rowand, at (416) 865-3517.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Nortel Networks Limited

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Fraser D. Rowand, Reg. No. 53,870

Place: Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Date: September 12, 2005